

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

**COLIN V. SHERIDAN,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**MATT TRICKEY,**

Defendant.

No. CV 10-6034-AC

OPINION AND ORDER

**MOSMAN, J.,**

On December 16, 2010, Magistrate Judge Acosta issued his Findings and Recommendation ("F&R") (#27) in the above-captioned case recommending that I grant defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (#21). Plaintiff did not file objections.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are

addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon review, I ADOPT Judge Acosta's F&R (#27) as my own, and I GRANT defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (#21).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 10th day of February, 2011.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman  
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN  
United States District Court